

Invasion Theories: Tool of the destruction for the Colonialists, Racists...

By: **Saumitra Sen**

January 30, 2006

Views expressed here are author's own and not of this website. Full disclaimer is at the bottom.

**Previous by:
Saumitra Sen**



[Feedback](#)

The concept of Aryan Invasion theory being a handiwork of the British colonialists for the sake of proving the superiority of the European Caucasian races is not an isolated case. There exist a similar theory in other part of the world, involving other nations and other ethnicities and I wonder why hasn't anyone yet given an attention over that.

If we see the map of middle Africa, we see two little countries named Rwanda and Burundi, bordering Zaire (or Democratic Republic of Congo). With the name Rwanda it suddenly flashes in our mind, the picture of ethnic violence, civil war, genocide and military juntas. Few Indians know the history of Rwanda or Burundi. These countries are inhabited by two different so-called ethnic groups, namely Hutu and Tutsi. The ethnic composition of these countries is as follows:

- 1) Rwanda – Hutu 84%, Tutsi 15%, Twa (Pygmies) 1%
- 2) Burundi – Hutu 85%, Tutsi 14%, Twa (Pygmies) 1%

Among these the minority Tutsis are believed to be the Hamitic people, a race which was often intermixed with the whiter races from North, particularly from Ethiopia and Egypt, which on their turn were intermixed by the Asiatic people, mainly Hittites, by the repeated invasions from the North. And these people are said to have arrived from North and thus not the native people of Rwanda.

The majority of Hutus are believed to be Bantu, the original African race which spilled out from the mid-Western African coast of Nigeria, Cameroon, Ghana, Togo, Benin, Cote d' Ivoire and the inland countries of Burkina Faso and some other parts of the neighbouring countries.

Tutsis are considered to be the foreigners, invaders or migrants in the Rwanda-Burundi region. Hutus are said to be a much older race but not the original one. The original inhabitants of the Rwanda-Burundi region are said to be the Pygmies, who consist only 1% of the population of the region. It is said that Tutsis despite being the minorities, consider themselves superior in race and constitute the reigning elite and aristocracy of Rwanda-Burundi and they have subjugated the more indigenous Hutus from centuries and have forced them to agriculture and to the inferior position. Now, the crystallization of the theory. Hutus and Tutsis are two completely separate races, with Black Hutus forming the oppressed majority and the more original inhabitants of Rwanda-Burundi, and the fairer Tutsis forming the oppressing minority and the foreign invaders.

This accounts for a Rwandan version of the Aryan Invasion Theory, namely the Tutsi Invasion theory.

Here we have some startling parallels with the Aryan Invasion theory

here. Northern Indians, namely Aryans are said to be the ultimate foreign invaders or migrants. Southern Indians, namely Dravidians are said to be the much older inhabitants of Indian sub-continent who were invaded by the Aryans and were oppressed and driven in the interiors and to the South of the Indian continent, with the ultimate consequence of being incorporated into the Hindu fold of caste system and occupying the lowest rung of Indian society. And even these so-called Dravidians are not considered as the original inhabitants of the India. There is said to be a Dravidian migration into India long before that of the Aryans, and some so-called aboriginals (such as Santhals) are considered to be the originals of India, which were forced into the jungles by the invasions, migrations of Dravidians, followed by Aryans.

About Aryan Invasion theory and the cause of its origin much has been said in this debate, and will be said in future so here I go for the explanation of Tutsi Invasion theory, its cause and origin and its socio-political consequences.

Hutus and Tutsis never as such existed as two different ethnic groups or races and were never at war with each other. The history of ethnic violence in the region began with the advent of colonialism in Africa and Rwanda-Burundi. Rwanda-Burundi was a part of German East Africa but after the World War I, it was occupied by Belgium and made a Belgian colony. It was these colonial Belgian masters of Rwanda-Burundi who started entertaining strange ethnic differences and racial differences between the two so-called different groups Hutus and Tutsis, and created the Hutu-Tutsi rift. They invented two separate races, the racist Tutsi Invasion theory and invented the divide between them, labeling Tutsis as aristocratic rulers and Hutus as the oppressed masses.

It seems that skin colour superiority is so deeply embedded in the psyche of West that they rarely get out of it.

While the Hutu and Tutsi are often considered by the followers of this Tutsi Invasion theory, as two separate ethnic groups, scholars point out that they speak the same language, have a history of intermarriage, and share many cultural characteristics. Traditionally, the differences between the two groups were occupational rather than ethnic. Agricultural people were considered Hutu, while the cattle-owning elite were identified as Tutsi. Supposedly Tutsi were tall, thin and fair, while Hutu were short, black and square, but it is often impossible to tell one from the other. (as reported by the Time Almanac)

This distinction was increased and racialized in 1933 by the Belgian government requirement that everyone carry an identity card indicating tribal ethnicity as Tutsi or Hutu, in order to play the power politics between the inhabitants of the nation and thus letting them bogged down in civil war.

Since, independence, repeated violence in both Rwanda and Burundi has increased ethnic differentiation between the groups. Some 2.5 million Tutsis and Hutus are massacred in mutual ethnic cleansing, and genocide. The usual opportunist African leaders are much common in Rwanda-Burundi and they have exacerbated the ethnic tensions of their countries by inciting the hatred between the two groups on the basis of the supposed ethnic difference between the two. Hutu leaders have described Tutsis as cockroaches and they used to telecast their views on radio during the 1994 Rwandan genocide of Tutsis, which inspired the common Hutus to massacre the Tutsis, in a bid to

annihilate them completely.

So a peaceful, placid nation with a common populace was destroyed and annihilated by the colonialist, racist view of the Tutsi Invasion theory.

But why are we learning this? Because Tutsi Invasion theory has ominous parallels with Aryan Invasion theory as explained above. The cause of the origin of TIT is also the same as that of AIT. And the ethnic tension and violence was also incited between the North Indians and the South Indians. The DMK, AIADMK and all the other anti-Hindu, anti-Brahmin movements (namely the Periyar movement) were the consequence of this racist Aryan Invasion theory. If not for Hinduism and its cultural ethos, India would have gone the way of Rwanda and Burundi. (Remember, Rwandans and Burundians have been converted to Christianity) But anti-Hindu leadership of India, and the Marxist academia and media is bent on defending the Aryan Invasion theory/AMT, in league with their traitorous aims, and anti-Hindu, anti-Indian designs. By keeping the various sections of Hindu society at war with each other they can maintain their political hold over India, and AIT is a proven tool for their designs.

The opposition of AIT is derided as an emotional, chauvinist handiwork of Hindu nationalist or fundamentalists. But the difference between Tutsis and Hutus is denied by the modern genuine Western scholars (non-Witzels). Is it also a handiwork of an emotional, chauvinist Tutsi nationalists?

The answer lies in the correct reading of the indigenous history through various new tools of Science and Archaeology and the deconstruction of the colonial edifice which has so far promoted the racist theories in order to prove the White supremacy.

Saumitra Sen



[Send your views to author](#)

Do you wish to reach our readers? [submit your guest column](#)

Copyright and Disclaimer:

The views expressed in this article are the author's own and not of this website. The author is solely responsible for the contents of this article. This website does not represent or endorse the accuracy, completeness or reliability of any opinion, statement, appeal, advice or any other information in the article. Our readers are free to forward this page URL to anyone. This column may NOT be transmitted or distributed by others in any manner whatsoever (other than forwarding or weblisting page URL) without the prior permission from [us and the author](#).